



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/082,495	02/22/2002	Jussi Ketonen	335.03	3734

7590 05/23/2005

Todd A. Noah
Dergosits & Noah LLP
Suite 1450
Four Embarcadero Center
San Francisco, CA 94111

EXAMINER

WINTER, JOHN M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3621

DATE MAILED: 05/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/082,495

Applicant(s)

KETONEN ET AL.

Examiner

John M Winter

Art Unit

3621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 March 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 19 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 3621

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-20 remain pending.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Response to Arguments

The applicants arguments filed on March 5, 2005 have been fully considered.

The Examiner states that claims 2-11, 15-18, and 20 are rejected in view of the newly discovered reference to Win et al (US Patent 6,182,142).

The Applicant states that the claims of the present invention are directed towards a different purpose and are not obvious in view of the prior art.

Examiner responds that as per *Ex parte Clapp*, 227 USPQ 972 (Bd Pat App & Int) "To support conclusion that claimed combination is directed to obvious subject matter, the references must either expressly or impliedly suggest claimed combination or the examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why artisan would have found claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the references teachings.", the Examiner states the references cited deals with the generalized problem of organizing and storing electronic data and therefore would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art.

See following rejection .

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright Jr. et al. (US Patent 6,324,542) in view of Wright Jr. et al. (US Patent 5,857,201).

Art Unit: 3621

As per claim 1,

Wright Jr et al. ('542) discloses a system for providing information to a mobile client comprising:

a mobile device for generating a query which has a visual display;(Column 5, lines 48-61 [uses PDA platform and has user interface])

wherein the query includes identification information about the mobile device and security information. (Column 11, lines 53-65[username, password etc..])

Wright Jr et al. ('542) does not explicitly disclose a broker which receives the query from the mobile device. Wright Jr et al. ('201) discloses a broker which receives the query from the mobile device. (Figure 3[FL server, message handler passes queries]) It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Wright Jr et al. ('542) device with the Wright Jr et al. ('201) component in order to enable a portable infrastructure for accessing data.

As per claim 12

Wright Jr et al. ('542) discloses the system for providing information to a mobile client comprising:

a mini-server having a mini-server rules database that stores data processing rules;(Column 4, lines 41-53; also figure 3)

wherein the mobile device transmits the query to the mini-server and the mini-server processes the query according to rules from the mini-server rules database.(Column 7, lines 29-54)

Wright Jr et al. ('542) does not explicitly disclose a mobile device for generating a query which includes identification information. Wright Jr et al. ('201) discloses a a mobile device for generating a query which includes identification information.(Figure 3[FL server, includes user name with query]) It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Wright Jr et al. ('542) device with the Wright Jr et al. ('201) component in order to enable a portable infrastructure for accessing data.

As per claim 13

Wright Jr et al. ('542) discloses the system for providing information to the mobile client of claim 12

wherein requested information is obtained and formatted by the mini-server for the visual display of the mobile device, (Figure 3)

the mini-server transmits the requested information to the mobile device(Figure 3) and a portion of the requested information is displayed on the visual display. (Column 5, lines 48-61)

As per claim 14

Wright Jr et al. ('542) discloses the system for providing information to the mobile client of claim 13

wherein the query includes security information and the requested information is transmitted to the mobile device over a secure connection if required by the security information.

Art Unit: 3621

(Figure 3)

Claims 2-11, 15-18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright Jr. et al. (US Patent 6,324,542) in view of Wright Jr. et al. (US Patent 5,857,201) and further in view of Win et al. (US Patent 6,182,142).

As per claim 2,

Wright Jr et al. ('542) discloses the system for providing information to a mobile client of claim 1, further comprising:

a mini-server having a mini-server rules database that stores data processing rules; wherein the broker transmits the query to the mini-server (Column 4, lines 41-53; also figure 3) and a secure connection is used to transmit the query if required by the security information. (Column 11, lines 53-65)

Wright Jr et al. ('542) does not explicitly disclose the broker and miniserver are independent computers. Win ('142) discloses the broker and miniserver are independent computers. (Column 4, lines 39-55 [..any number of protected servers – these servers send requests for information to each other]) It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Wright Jr et al. ('542) device with the Win ('142) component in order to enable an infrastructure for accessing data.

As per claim 3,

Wright Jr et al. ('542) discloses the system for providing information to a mobile client of claim 2

wherein the mini-server processes the query according to rules obtained from the mini-server rules database. (Column 7, lines 29-54)

As per claim 4

Wright Jr et al. ('542) discloses the system for providing information to the mobile client of claim 3

wherein requested information is obtained and formatted for the visual display of the mobile device and the mini-server transmits the requested information to the broker. (Figure 3)

As per claim 5

Wright Jr et al. ('542) discloses the system for providing information to the mobile client of claim 4

wherein the requested information is transmitted from the broker to the mobile device (Figure 3) and at least a portion requested information is displayed on the visual display (Column 5, lines 48-61).

As per claim 6

Wright Jr et al. ('542) discloses the system for providing information to the mobile client of claim 1 further comprising:

a personal agent computer having a personal agent rules database that stores data processing rules; wherein in response to the broker receiving the query from the mobile device,

Art Unit: 3621

the broker transmits retrieval information to the mobile device (Column 4, lines 41-53; also figure 3) and the broker transmits the query to the personal agent over a secure connection. (Column 11, lines 53-65)

Wright Jr et al. ('542) does not explicitly disclose the broker and the personal agent computer are independent computers. Win ('142) discloses the broker and the personal agent computer are independent computers. (Column 4, lines 39-55 [..any number of protected servers – these servers send requests for information to each other]) It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Wright Jr et al. ('542) device with the Win ('142) component in order to enable an infrastructure for accessing data.

As per claim 7

Wright Jr et al. ('542) discloses the system for providing information to the mobile devices of claim 6

wherein the personal agent computer processes the query according to rules obtained from the personal agent rules database. (Column 7, lines 29-54)

As per claim 8

Wright Jr et al. ('542) discloses the system for providing information to the mobile client of claim 7

wherein requested information is obtained and formatted for the visual display of the mobile device and the personal agent computer transmits the requested information to the broker.(Figure 3)

As per claim 9

Wright Jr et al. ('542) discloses the system for providing information to the mobile devices of claim 8

wherein if the retrieval information is transmitted to the broker the requested information is transmitted to the mobile device (Figure 3) and at least a portion requested information is displayed on the visual display. (Column 5, lines 48-61)

As per claim 10

Wright Jr et al. ('542) discloses the system for providing information to mobile devices of claim 1, further comprising: a mini-server having a mini-server rules database that stores data processing rules; and a personal agent computer having a personal agent rules database that stores data processing rules. wherein the broker has a broker rules database that stores data processing rules and the broker transmits the query to either the mini-server or the personal agent computer in accordance with rules from the broker rules database. (Column 4, lines 41-53; also figure 3)

Wright Jr et al. ('542) does not explicitly disclose the broker and the personal agent computer are independent computers. Win ('142) discloses the broker and the personal agent computer are independent computers. (Column 4, lines 39-55 [..any number of protected servers – these servers send requests for information to each other]) It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Wright Jr et al. ('542) device with the Win ('142) component in order to enable an infrastructure for accessing data.

Art Unit: 3621

As per claim 11

Wright Jr et al. ('542) discloses the system for providing information to mobile devices of claim 10,

wherein the personal agent computer or mini-server processes the query according to rules obtained from the personal agent rules database or the mini-server rules database. (Column 7, lines 29-54)

As per claim 15

Wright Jr et al. ('542) discloses a method for providing information to a mobile device comprising the steps:

providing a mobile device having a visual display,(Figure 3 [User interface])
a broker and a mini-server having a mini-server database; (Figure 3 [Data Store element 170])

processing the query according to rules from the mini-server database;(Column 7, lines 29-54)

obtaining requested information;(Column 7, lines 29-54)

formatting the requested information for the visual display of the mobile device;

transmitting the requested information to the mobile device;

displaying at least a portion of the requested information on the visual display of the mobile device. (Figure 3[FL server, User interface])

Wright Jr et al. ('542) does not explicitly disclose transmitting a query which includes identification information to the broker; transmitting the query from the broker to the mini-server. Wright Jr et al. ('201) discloses transmitting a query which includes identification information to the broker; transmitting the query from the broker to the mini-server; (Figure 3 [FL server]) It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Wright Jr et al. ('542) device with the Wright Jr et al. ('201) component in order to enable a portable infrastructure for accessing data.

Wright Jr et al. ('542) does not explicitly disclose the broker and miniserver are independent computers. Win ('142) discloses the broker and miniserver are independent computers. (Column 4, lines 39-55 [..any number of protected servers – these servers send requests for information to each other]) It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Wright Jr et al. ('542) device with the Win ('142) component in order to enable an infrastructure for accessing data.

Claim 18 is in parallel with claim 15 and is rejected for at least the same reasons.

As per claim 16

Wright Jr et al. ('542) discloses the method for providing information to mobile devices of claim 15 further comprising the steps:

transmitting retrieval information to the mobile device; and transmitting the requested information to the mobile device if the retrieval information is transmitted to the broker. (Figure 3)

Art Unit: 3621

As per claim 17

Wright Jr et al. ('542) discloses the method for providing information to mobile devices of claim 15

wherein the query includes security information and the transmitting steps are made over secure connections if required by the security information. (Figure 3)

As per claim 20

Wright Jr et al. ('542) discloses the method for providing information to mobile devices of claim 18 wherein the query includes security information and the transmitting steps made are over secure connections if required by the security information. (Column 11, lines 53-65)

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 19 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Examiners note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Winter whose telephone number is (571) 272-6713. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:30am-5:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, **James Trammell** can be reached at (571) 272-6712.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Art Unit: 3621

Washington, D.C. 20231


or faxed to:

(703) 305-7687 [Official communications; including After Final communications labeled "Box AF"]

(703) 308-1396 [Informal/Draft communications, labeled "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"]

Hand delivered responses should be brought to the Examiner in the Knox Building, 50 Dulany St. Alexandria, VA.

JMW
May 15, 2005



JAMES P. BRAMMELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600